

Corres. and Mail
BOX AF

ATTENTION: BOX AFTER FINAL
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE REQUESTED
EXAMINING GROUP 1773



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Herbert PEIFFER et al.

Application No.: 09/274,781

Filed: March 24, 1999

)
)
) Group Art Unit: 1773
)
) Examiner: V. Chen
)
)

RECEIVED
JUN 10 2002
TC 1700

For: TRANSPARENT POLYESTER FILM WITH HIGH OXYGEN BARRIER
AND ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONALITY, ITS USE AND PROCESS FOR ITS
PRODUCTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231
Sir:

Transmittal Letter

Enclosed is a reply to the Final Office Action of February 12, 2002. The items checked below are appropriate:

- ☒ Applicants hereby petition for a one month extension of time to respond to the above Office Action.
- ☒ A check for \$110.00 to cover the above fee is enclosed.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Dated: June 4, 2002

By: 

Steven J. Scott
Reg. No. 43,911

06/07/2002 JADD01 00000009 09274781

01 FC:115

110.00 OP



JUN 10 2002
TC 1700

ATTENTION: BOX AFTER FINAL
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE REQUESTED
EXAMINING GROUP 1773

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Herbert PEIFFER et al.

Application No.: 09/274,781

Filed: March 24, 1999

)
)
) Group Art Unit: 1773
)
) Examiner: V. Chen
)
)

AEJ/Recon (UE)
#18/6/11/02

For: TRANSPARENT POLYESTER FILM WITH HIGH OXYGEN BARRIER
AND ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONALITY, ITS USE AND PROCESS FOR ITS
PRODUCTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231
Sir:

Response After Final

This communication responds to the Final Office Action dated February 12, 2002. The period for response has been extended by one month to June 12, 2002, by the enclosed Petition for Extension of Time and corresponding fee.

The Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-23 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,054,212. In response to the rejection, applicants attach a Terminal Disclaimer over the '212 patent. The submission of the Terminal Disclaimer should obviate the rejection. As noted in MPEP § 804.02, the filing of this Terminal Disclaimer does not constitute an admission of the propriety of the rejection.

Since no other rejections remain pending in this application, applicants respectfully look forward to receipt of a Notice of Allowance. If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: _____

Steven J. Scott
Reg. No. 43,911

Date: June 4, 2002